

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/611,998	07/03/2003	Chih-I Lin	LINC3175/EM	3387
23364	7590 05/30/2006		EXAMINER	
	THOMAS, PLLC	DAVIS, DANIEL J		
625 SLATERS LANE FOURTH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			3733	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
			DATE MAILED: 05/30/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/611,998	LIN ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	D. Jacob Davis	3733		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was provided to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timus will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	♣. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 M</u> 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E 	action is non-final.			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 2 and 10-16 is/are pending in the app 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 2 and 10-16 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.			
Application Papers				
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on <u>08 March 2006</u> is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	 a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Settion is required if the drawing(s) is obtained. 	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s)	. 4) ☐ Interview Summar	v (PTO-413)		
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No(s)/Mail [
.S. Patent and Trademark Office		And of Dance No (Mail Date 20060520		

Application/Control Number: 10/611,998

Art Unit: 3733

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 10 and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,248,110 to Reiley et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,514,137 to Coutts. Reiley discloses in figures 40-41 and column 24, lines 15-47 a single layer permeable filling member 510 receiving a pasty material while placed within the spine. Reiley further discloses a connection tube to expel the cement within the mesh.

Reiley does not disclose how the cement is inserted. Nevertheless,

Coutts teaches a holding portion, an injection port, a syringe, a barrel and
plunger as viewed in figure 1 to inject cement through a connection tube and into
bone. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the
invention was made to make the Reiley device to include a syringe with its
respective parts to be connected to the connecting tube in order to expel the
pasty material.

Art Unit: 3733

Reiley fails to disclose the size of the pores in the mesh filling member 510. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to Describe modification and press the to make the holes to have a diameter less than 0.1 mm since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

Reiley is silent regarding the makeup of the cement. Coutts teaches that hydroxylapatite is combined with a liquid to form the cement. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the Reiley cement out of a hyroxyapatite and water as taught by Coutts to fill and treat the damaged tissue.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,248,110 to Reiley et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,514,137 to Coutts and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,549,679 to Kuslich. Reiley fails to disclose a multilayered wall construction. Kuslich discloses in figures 53-56 a multilayered wall construction to increase the stiffness of the structure (column 21-24). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the Reiley mesh device to include multiple layers to increase its stiffness.

Art Unit: 3733

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect filed March 8, 2006 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to D. Jacob Davis whose telephone number is (571) 272-4693. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eduardo C. Robert can be reached on (571) 272-4719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DID

PEDUARDO Ø/ROBERT UPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER